



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ST
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,876	04/27/2001	Steven P. Ungetheim	93214.032	1747
7590	05/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Paul F. Wille 6407 East Clinton Street Scottsdale, AZ 85254				FOX, CHARLES A
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3652		

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/844,876	Applicant(s) UNGETHEIM ET AL.
	Examiner Charles A. Fox	Art Unit 3652
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
<p>THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>		
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>		
<p>NOTE: _____. </p>		
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). </p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The a)<input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b)<input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. </p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. </p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)<input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b)<input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. </p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>		
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____. </p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____. </p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-a-14-11</u> </p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved or b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. </p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____. </p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. </p>		
 DEAN J. KRAMER PRIMARY EXAMINER		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicants arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

In regards to a ramp for a bus not being analogous with a ramp for a minivan, the examiner holds that any ramp for helping load a handicapped person onto any vehicle is analogous art in terms of the instant application. It is noted that claim 11 does not claim any benefits of a reduced size ramp. As such the Peterson reference is analogous to the instant application. In regards to the motivation to combine the Petersen and Eisen references the Eisen reference is specifically designed with a foldable platform that is designed to carry a wheelchair when deployed. As such one of ordinary skill in the art would look to both the Petersen and the Eisen references when deciding on how to make a folding platform for supporting a wheelchair. The Vartanian references teaches a gear motor to move a folding ramp for a wheelchair in place of a hydraulic actuator. As such Vartanian teaches replacing a known type of actuator on a wheelchair ramp with a gear motor. That is motivation to combine the references. In the Roth-Stielow reference it is noted that the heat dissipating load is used as a brake on an electric motor, as such it meets the limitations of the claims. The claims stand as rejected in the final rejection.